

**From:** zoble morris  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 12:28 AM  
**Subject:** FCC meeting on June 2, 2003

please do not allow the proposed changes to the broadcast rules of ownership. I do not believe it would be in the best interest of the public!

**From:** a p  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 12:33 AM  
**Subject:** media ownership vote

The American public is intelligent enough to understand that the changes you are proposing are in the interests of large media corporations. We understand that these changes will further diminish the diversity and quality of media coverage. THIS IS NOT IN THE PUBLIC'S BEST INTEREST. The intention to pass such changes makes the FCC suspect of corruption. Please follow your conscience and do the right thing for the American public.

Albert Williams  
Austin, Texas

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Dan Schramm  
**To:** Dan Schramm, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 12:34 AM  
**Subject:** Forget My Last Email via Average Joe in Chicago Illinois - What A Sham You Run - You Should Be Ashamed

Chairperson Powell and fellow Commissioners:

Please disregard my email below that was sent earlier when I was under the false impression that this was an issue still under review and open consideration.

Obviously, when the Chairperson of the FCC goes public on his own voting intentions and his assumptions prior to the final meeting, it shows that there was no real review or viable process considering your vote tomorrow or even those of your associates.

Rather it was a just a disappointing sham

Mr. Powell - just a little thing on tact - why not use "No Comment" instead of voicing your intentions on what were supposed to be non-biased and made during your meeting (not prior). Notice how your comments will influence stock prices tomorrow morning (Monday), which is a thorough breach of professional standards in my opinion.

It is shameful that you play corporate politics and bow to pressure

At least you old man still sticks up for himself and his beliefs even under considerable pressure from Rumsfeld and the other croonies down the block from you.

Respectfully (albeit begrudgingly),  
Dan Schramm

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan Schramm  
Sent: Wed 5/28/2003 8:26 PM  
To: 'mpowell@fcc.gov'  
Cc: 'kabernat@fcc.gov'; 'mcopps@fcc.gov'; 'kjmweb@fcc.gov'; 'jadelste@fcc.gov'  
Subject: Request from an Average Joe in Chicago Illinois who pays taxes and votes (hoping you could consider)

Chairman Powell and fellow Commissioners:

As what would be dubbed as "an average Joe" - (married, kids, mortgage, two cars, goes to church during weddings/funerals but not regularly, owns a small company, has two TVs, a computer and saving for kids college funds), I am humbly request that you, as public servants, at least consider the following plea/request before you elect to move forward and vote on June 2nd, pertaining to the following slated items:

2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (MB Docket No. 02-277);

Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers (MM Docket No. 01-235);  
Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets (MM Docket No. 01-317); and  
Definition of Radio Markets (MM Docket No. 00-244).

1) As a watcher of TV, subscriber of cable, listener of radio, subscriber of Chicago Tribune, Sun Times and a host of magazines, even here in Chicago, it was shocking to see how already

companies such as Viacom, Clear Channel, The Tribune Company and Fox already had a strong cross ownership presence in the media I watch, read, listen to as a trusted source, and depend on. Even in what is termed as an "A" market, it is alarming that I am subject to a handful of sources, rather than what competition in an "A" market should provide. Heck, I have more of a selection of hot dog manufacturers and hot dog products made here in Chicago, than I do news/media sources that have some semblance of ownership or key representation here.

2) I can only imagine how individuals that live in rural towns or "C" and "D" markets would be subject to one to two sources of information. I realize this is assumption, but it is not assumption to state the unbelievable rate of decline of participant media players nationwide over the past five years alone. Also, it is not assumption to state that such media conglomerates tend to provide their media in a select patterned fashion that spans the various mediums they present in (whether voice, paper, or data feed)

3) That I had to come across this issue only after watching NOW on PBS or read an article in Chicago Sun Times only days ago that mentioned that this is being pushed to vote on June 2nd without much if any review (even in spite of cross-party requests in Congress) is alarming. If this "average Joe" just found out about this then my God what about the other countless Joes and Jane's in the USA. I can state this because of the ten adult registered voters who are "average Joe" friends of mine, only one of the ten (1 of 10) was aware of this issue and that this is coming to vote on June 2nd.

In closing, I humbly request that you delay just until your next slated meeting or heck, have a special meeting in 30 days from now, just to allow proper response and communication on the pros/cons of this to the "average Joes" in the public. It would be a tragedy if our FCC would steamroll this through knowing that most (at least 70% minimum - and I am being generous) does not know what this pertains to.

Ladies and Gentlemen, is this what democracy and good trusted government is about. Is this what an objective press is about?

If you opt not to, would at least one of you respond with your thoughts (heck even telling me to go pound sand would at least be an honest response)

Respectfully

Dan Schramm  
Chicago, IL

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** bagheera@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 12:48 AM  
**Subject:** Regarding deregulation of OUR airwaves - Don't do it...

Greetings,

With all due respect, changing the rules and regulations governing the way our airwaves are handled is a horrendous mistake. Giving the larger media-corporations and broadcast companies the opportunity to have more stations in their stable is just plain dangerous.

The rules have been put there for a good reason: to give everyone an equal opportunity to voice their opinions. Dissent is healthy in a democracy.

Without it, we live in a dictatorship. Reports in the news have quoted you as saying that the "rules are outdated and need to be changed". Well, the CONSTITUTION is quite a bit older, but it works. Good rules and regulations don't have to be changed if they help everyone and serve the common good. Changing it to favor a few is the worst possible thing you can do.

I'll put it to you simply: By having only one viewpoint being broadcast, we no longer are given the choice to get alternate information. The whole idea that there are "numerous sources of info on the internet" is utterly ridiculous. The same few "recognized" companies will be giving only their spin on the news, while the "little guys" are viewed as crackpots and loons.

Look what happened to deregulating the airlines. It failed miserably, and now they are some of the biggest welfare recipients in the U.S. The same thing happened by deregulating the power companies in California; utter failure and corruption. Changing long-held rules of regulation governing corporations have led to MASSIVE corruption and scandal. We cannot trust these corporations to police themselves. YOUR job is to police them; instead, it seems you want to give the criminals the keys to the prison.

I urge you to NOT change the rules that now exist to protect us.

Do not cross this threshold. Putting the genie back in the bottle is near impossible to do.

Rupert Murdoch and Fox have repeatedly proven themselves to be mouthpieces for the current administration, and stifle any dissenting opinions

ClearChannel

Communications was BANNING songs from musicians that elected to use their First Amendment right, and still you say that there is no problem with amending

these rules. Now, more than ever, we need a VARIED source of information, not one homogenous viewpoint coming from fewer and fewer companies.

Remember, these are OUR airwaves; they belong to "We the people...", NOT just a few wealthy people to do with as they see fit.

What will it take to convince you that this is a bad idea?

George Willis  
Burbank, California.

P.S. I work in the television and film industry. ALL of my coworkers in the post-production field agree that this is a mistake of tragic proportions. When people who work in this industry --who often are on completely opposite sides of a bitter political fence-- agree that it is a bad idea, then you know something is wrong.

**From:** Lynn Parker  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 12:49 AM  
**Subject:** Rule Changes

Your decision to permit companies to own more radio and television stations will put more engineers out of work and is in general a very bad idea. Please reconsider!!

I am a broadcast engineer no longer working in broadcasting after 18 years in the business.

Lynn Parker  
General Radiotelephone Licensee  
(Originally a 1st Class)

**From:** Jeremy Ireland  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 12:54 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Jeremy Ireland (gjireland@hotmail.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I urge you to promote a diverse, balanced, and competitive media. Please oppose the FCC rule change on June 2, 2003.

We allow media companies to use the airwaves in exchange for their assurance that they're serving the public interest, and it's the FCC's job to make sure that's so. Please hold the FCC to its mandate and oppose the rule change.

Sincerely,  
Jeremy Ireland

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 24.136.177.58  
Remote IP address: 24.136.177.58



**From:** Sam Nese  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:02 AM  
**Subject:** Against rule change, June 2, 2003

Dear Chairman Abernathy,

I am opposed to the rule change to be voted on by the FCC on June 2, 2003. Another step toward greater corporate media control is another step away from the democratic values and principles on which our nation is supposed to be based.

Sincerely,  
Samuel Nese

**From:** Marie Ramirez  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:06 AM  
**Subject:** FCC Vote on New Regulations

Dear Chairman Powell,

The FCC was created to protect the interest of citizens, ensuring impartial coverage of all views and news. My understanding is that you are voting on new regulations that will actually loosen existing rules for megacompanies to own multiple media stations. I am alarmed that this will even further restrict our news coverage to one-sided, biased coverage. Please uphold the public interest by voting against this regulation, which can only serve to further the interests of large broadcasting corporations and thwart the free exchange of information that is at the heart of our democracy.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Marie T. Ramirez  
Sunnyvale, California

**From:** Karen Ozmun  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:09 AM  
**Subject:** PLEASE ... DO NOT CHANGE THE RULES!!

Just because rules have been around for decades, does not necessarily make them irrelevant. I have observed how the consolidation of media ownership has affected the information landscape. It has clearly had a negative impact in local news and radio here in Seattle. Long gone is the edge and risk and degree of local reporting. We know less about what's happening in our own backyard.

PLEASE ... retain what little regulation there is to try and stem the tide of the homogenization of information we all get. It does not serve me, our city, our region, or our country well.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Ozmun  
Seattle, Washington

**From:** Rocky Crites  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:11 AM  
**Subject:** Rules regarding ownership of media

Dear Commissioners;

I urge you to block any move by media conglomerates to own more outlets!! The overall media ownership is much too concentrated now!

All of the major networks and most of the newsprint and cable TV media share a very narrow set of viewpoints. Allowing that small group of people to consolidate a greater share of the whole media universe will only close off huge groups of people from ever being heard. No one with a viewpoint not supported by these conglomerates will ever be heard from again.

The existence of internet sources and small cable outlets are insufficient. While some (like myself) will use these sources to search for what we want to know; the vast majority of America will blindly and dumbly listen to whatever the conglomerates tell them and believe that "since the conglomerates are operating on a government approved channel, they must be truthful". Yeah -- right. And all of their commercials are exactly truthful, too.

Consider these questions: When was the last time you saw a program that supported the Second Amendment?? When was the last time you saw a program that supported two-parent families and condemned aberrant sexual behavior?? When was the last time you saw any program that had a strong, intelligent, lead role played by a white male? Don't give me the excuse that the "public likes it because they watch it". They watch it because there is nothing better on. And the advertisers pick from what they are offered to buy advertising time on.

Keep the rules at least as tight as they are! We need MORE owners not fewer!

Thank you for your help in this regard.

Rocky Crites, Captain, USAF, ret  
Who you are is your DECISION.. NOT a DISCOVERY.

**From:** Erik Seims  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:14 AM  
**Subject:** Proposed Revisions to Media Ownership Rules

You don't need me to reiterate the problems with the proposed rulemaking. I suppose you are aware of them, and that those of you who approve of this deregulation will vote for it regardless.

You are setting yourselves up for disaster. With the media in the hands of even fewer entities than it is now, the already shaky level of trust and credibility the entire media now commands will become nonexistent. Every conceivable news story and programming decision will become fodder for speculation about who put story x on the air and kept story y off, and why story z was reported the way it was, and who is whispering in the three or four ears that will have a virtual hammerlock on mass communication in this country.

Such speculation will lead to more paranoia, more mistrust (which may very well cut across the entire political spectrum), and ultimately a destabilizing communication breakdown which would alienate untold millions of Americans from public discourse and the democratic process.

Does that matter to you?

Someday, when one of you or your loved ones wants -- needs -- to find a major news source with another point of view and cannot, you will no doubt look back upon what you did today, and upon the 1996 rulemaking encouraged by the previous administration. I wonder what you will feel, or not feel, when that happens.

Best wishes,  
Erik Seims

keseims@hotmail.com

**CC:** keseims@hotmail.com

**From:** Charlie Schweim  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:20 AM  
**Subject:** Relaxing ownership regulations

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I'm sure you've heard all the arguments, both pro and con, regarding the relaxation of ownership regulations currently under consideration by the other Commission members and yourself. While I want to make it clear that I adamantly oppose such relaxation, I think it all comes down to one consideration.

If those opposing said relaxation are right, then all of us who don't own a network will lose something absolutely vital: the right always to hear from all sides of an issue. Whether we are wrong or not, however, all that is to be gained is greater profits for several corporations and their shareholders. While the latter is not insignificant, I believe its importance pales in comparison to the importance of having a well informed populace.

If, as I believe, it all comes down to having a matter of a wide and varied media available to the many versus greater profits available to the few, I think the choice is obvious. We cannot take the chance of relaxing these regulations when the losses are, at least potentially, so enormous and the gains are so paltry.

I sincerely hope I can count on you to do the right thing and leave the ownership regulations as they currently stand. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Charlie Schweim

**From:** Daniel Kipp  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:45 AM  
**Subject:** NO on de-regulation, please!!

To whom it may concern: can you search your heart of hearts, and honestly say that you think that it is in the people's best interest, to take the people's airwaves, and to further limit the views from, what, 5 corporations, now? To make it okay for a fewer number of corporations, or people with power, for example Murdoch, to limit what is seen by the American people, further than it already is? For example, compare the REST OF THE WORLD'S Press with America's press coverage of the American war in Iraq. The american coverage was so vanilla, so much a pep rally, compared to the reality of the war.

If nothing else, it is a bad idea to limit the views that are seen. Case in point: I give you Totalitarianistic Russia and Germany under the 3rd Reich. Now THAT is consolidation of the press, and also very evil.

I urge you to vote against de-regulation.

Thank you for your time,  
Daniel

**From:** BoasrplnV@aol.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:56 AM  
**Subject:** The Public disTrust

These are various letters I've sent to various "media outlets".  
You say there are so many choices out there...but only if you have a spare one to three THOUSAND dollars to access it.  
The public airwaves are of the PUBLIC TRUST FUND. Our tax dollars and investment developed the technology (as with MANY pharmaceuticals, land trusts, etc.) that you ought to sense the robbery you are proposing.  
As you can see, consolidation that will begin in just a few hours will wipe out the opinions of both the Pope and the Dixie Chicks.  
I surely hope that when your children become one-dimensional, attention fractured sheep; you will realise that, at your hands, today's de-regulation actions will lead to a population so dim, that sociopaths shall surely be the norm. Surely, at least HALF of the programming should be just programming.....but now, 34% to 48% are ads between show segments with an additional 10% added to the bottom third of the screen during shows. We now are above the 50% marks (55%!).

Letter to Milwaukee Channel 12--Nov 2000

Hey Jerry, show'em your journalistic integrity, for once.....6 HOURS of Football on the night before the election and you all are still delaying Nightline and Politically Incorrect to show people in a bar, toasting millionaire jocks and offering them plastic horses and fake money.....if you do not properly maintain the Public Trust provided to you, it will be taken away.

Letter to Mr. Steve Case December 1999

Please note my strong protest of placing advertisements in MAD Magazine for the first time in 46 years.

The simple pleasure of reading MAD, uninterrupted by sales pitches, has been one of the most important aspects of my life. For over thirty years I've learned to read, laugh and learn through its unique medium.

Are we on a path where all content ( which you now control most of ) is interrupted every few seconds, or even constantly, by sales pitches?

Cannot someone buy and read something, without being asked every few seconds to buy another thing?

I would proffer that these affronts to ones deep attention will lead viewers to be so fractured in their attention span that people will no longer sense any value in your products. Further, the bad karma will lead to AOL stock to tumble 90%.

,Letter to UPN

How can I put this kindly? Between Time/Warner Cable weakening the UPN signal during StarTrekVoyager, the UPN logo remaining on all the time so that every time someone views a console they're staring at the logo, cutting out the last season only to show it in a ten hour marathon and in-your-face wrestling type intros...I have found one of the best bits of tv viewing considerably annoying.

Please save this show from becoming just more noise.

[Time/Warner now weakens signals (e.g. Oxygen--except Sundays) to save money]



## Tribune Privacy Policy

"...information can be collected and used by third parties without our knowledge and may result in unsolicited messages from other individuals or third parties."

Honestly, I don't know why I bother (but this will be the last time).

It takes ten minutes for my broadband connection to start.

Your music newsgroups are constantly missing pieces.

I will tell you (again) that these are not copyrighted materials.

I've challenged you to try and download these clips and you've shuddered away.

Your service is poor and there are plenty (better providers) to take your place.

Perhaps the thousands of dollars I pay to you for unserved services means nothing, but it will truly be your loss.

The true "Bottom Line" is SERVICE....then, maybe we'll sign-up with you again.

\$45- broadband

\$50- 2Aol Accounts

\$110- Cable Bill

\$2500 per year, hey maybe, with some broken down modems, I could buy Time/Warner, whadya' think?

## Statement by C. Michael Powell:

"Lack of information about what was said and when it was broadcast should not be allowed to derail our enforcement of the laws."

.. what about what was NOT reported?

## To Time /Warner/Aol Cable:

I've yet to receive info regarding dropping WHA-21 PBS to add another block of religious programming. Since you argue that the PBS stations had overlapping content, does this not apply to channels 21 and 18 both showing the "700 Club" simultaneously? Copies of my request have been sent to various, concerned Federal entities. Please send info promptly as this will aid my decision whether to continue any of your services. These include digital cable, 3 movie premium packs, roadrunner, aol, time mag, etc.

Thank you for your prompt reply,

AOL offers help for phone scams...Searched AOL for "phone scam"  
Below is the output (links removed)

Search for "phone scam" on.

Find Best Prices on "phone scam" at DealTime  
Encyclopedia articles that mention "phone scam"  
Home Pages about "phone scam"  
Kids Only sites about "phone scam"  
boasrplnv@aol.com

**From:** Thomas O. Breitling  
**To:** Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 6:25 PM  
**Subject:** Ruling

I saw the ruling by the three "Republicans" on media ownership June 2, 2003. Sadly the three "Republicans" are enemies of the Republic.

Thomas O. Breitling  
4794 South 2124 East  
Holladay, Utah 84117  
801-277-3419

**From:** Jade Butman  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 6:45 PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

The FCC is giving all Republicans a bad name. This deregulation is a disgrace and unless you have your head buried in the sand or so far in the skies of "theory" as to have lost sight of your common sense, I'm not sure how you can sleep at night. Deregulating the media industry is going to be disastrous to this country and this world- it's already nearly impossible to get a straight objective story- once the control is in even fewer hands, we're all screwed- including you.

I never thought I would join what I thought were the "hysterical" ranks of protesters- but I now find myself in this surreal place wondering how on earth in this day and age with a democratic environment that something so horrible and evil is being done. And I wonder to myself, where are those hysterical democrats that are always protesting- where are those democratic senators and congress people, to protect us from the likes of you

Jade Butman, Esq.  
95 Greenpoint Ave., Apt. 4R  
Brooklyn, NY 11222

(646) 872-6178

**From:** Gary Hertweck  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 6:46 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Gary Hertweck (mghertweck@aol.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein,

Thank you for taking your stand today on the latest disaster put forth by the FCC. Keep up the fight! Honest, hardworking Americans will organize and respond to this assault on consumers' rights. Thanks again for your hard work on our behalf.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 152.163.252.198  
Remote IP address 152.163.252.198

**From:** Steven J. Gilinsky  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:00 PM  
**Subject:** new rules

Chairman Powell,

I was disappointed in the rulings today concerning radio. I am a small market radio station owner and because the rules are the way they are, We could never be bought by one of the area's major broadcasters. We have survived consolidation as we go up against both Clear Channel and Citadel. We do very well but the way the rules read, we may never have the chance to sell our station. This is probably the case in every small market in this Country. Something should have been done in the small markets where the law could at least say there must be at least 2 separate voices. Either there should be no consolidation in these markets or the maximum consolidation. I am a Republican and wanted to express my thoughts on today's rulings.

Sincerely Yours,

Steven J. Gilinsky  
Binghamton, NY

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Kurt  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:27 PM  
**Subject:** fcc ruling

what a sad, sad day hurray for meglamedia. now i can look forward to even more endless television trash from fox, the virtual elimination of local news and a censored and filtered world view from again fox, cnn etc... god help all of you, and us. you blew it.

kurt kleman

**From:** Kurt  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:28 PM  
**Subject:** fcc ruling

what a sad, sad day. hurray for meglamedia. now i can look forward to even more endless television trash from fox, the virtual elimination of local news and a censored and filtered world view from again fox, cnn etc... god help all of you, and us. you blew it.

kurt kleman

**From:** Keith Benson  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:31 PM  
**Subject:** deregulation

Please do not believe the hype that relaxing these regulations will expand news service. It won't. Business screams for deregulation and it has never come to what the protracters say. The airline industry went from flying the friendly skys to flying cattle cars, the savings and loan industry went wild with members money. Where there is big money, there is big corruption. Censorship is only around the corner. I can see the mega corps telling a small station not to report a news item with the threat of removing funds or shutting them down. A nice work-a-round against the 1st amendment. It is naive to think this will not happen.

Another deregulation mistake is being made.



**From:** Susan Eckley  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:31 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Susan Eckley (siouxex@hotmail.com) writes:

Thank you for the hours of work you must have put in on letting people know about this meeting. I'm going to start in on Congress now.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.66.244.111  
Remote IP address: 68.66.244.111

**From:** Keith Benson  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:32 PM  
**Subject:** deregulation

Please do not believe the hype that relaxing these regulations will expand news service. It won't. Business screams for deregulation and it has never come to what the protracters say. The airline industry went from flying the friendly skys to flying cattle cars, the savings and loan industry went wild with members money. Where there is big money, there is big corruption. Censorship is only around the corner. I can see the mega corps telling a small station not to report a news item with the threat of removing funds or shutting them down. A nice work-a-round against the 1st amendment. It is naive to think this will not happen.

Another deregulation mistake is being made.

**From:** cbriscoe@hevanet.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:32 PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

I will not stand for further consolidation of media ownership in this country and will support any consumer lawsuit intended to overturn today's decision by the FCC. Any movement in this direction is frankly dangerous for democracy. A diversity of ideas is essential to achieve the goal of an informed population. The already concentrated nature of the media marketplace has clearly already done damage such as eliminating local programming and further marginalizing any point of view not supported by a major media corporation.

The FCC received unprecedented numbers of public comments on this rule change, the vast majority of them negative. Ignoring this sort of public outcry flies in the face of our democratic system. The FCC would do well to remember that it is accountable to the citizens of the United States, not to media conglomerates.

I urge you to take a long hard look at the changes you made today to our valuable and already loose media regulations. The people are watching and they know that this change and the process of its implementation stink of partisanship, cronyism and an absence of concern for the public good.

Craig M. Briscoe  
Citizen, Voter  
5217 N. Amherst St.  
Portland, OR 97203

**From:** Lillian Dunlap  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 11:15 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Lillian Dunlap (crelil@aol.com) writes:

Thank you for your thoughtful and well-supported comments against today's FCC ruling. I fear for us as consumers.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 65.127.186.230  
Remote IP address: 65.127.186.230

**From:** Lori Elizabeth Daily  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 11:15 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Lori Elizabeth Daily (loridaily@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

Thank you for your comments today and your efforts to further localism within our media landscape. As an employee of a regional broadcasting company and as a consumer of media as a citizen, I too, can see no value in shrinking the number of voices present in our current landscape. I am deeply disturbed by the decision of the commission, and appreciate your vocal and adamant objection to it. May others become engaged in this conversation as well.

Regards,  
Lori Daily  
Raleigh, NC

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.187.215.130  
Remote IP address: 216.187.215.130

**From:** Wes676767@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 11:20 AM  
**Subject:** Ownership Rules

How you could allow this to pass today is beyond me.

CLEARLY the interests of we Americans who own the airwaves was NOT considered. Such a blatant dereliction of your duty ought to be cause to see all who voted for this change replaced at once. Pandering to your pals with the big bucks in this manner is unacceptable.

Thanks for nothing!

Bill Shannon  
365 S. West Ave #5  
Elmhurst Illinois  
60126